This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 25, 2007. Claims 1, 4 to 12 and 14 to 18 remain in the application, with Claims 2 and 13 having been canceled herein. Claims 1 and 12 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 7 was objected to for an informality that has been attended to by amendment as recited above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to delete a hyperlink. In this regard, the hyperlink was previously amended to delete the "http://" portion. However, Applicants have now amended the hyperlink to recite the full title of the document to which the hyperlink refers. The entire subject matter of that document being incorporated by reference, of course, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0027593 (Wilkins) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,643 (Cheng), and Claims 2, 4, 6 to 8, 10, 11 and 15 were rejected under § 103(a) over Wilkins in view of Cheng and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,740 (Cockrill). The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention relates to undoing execution of a function on a computer object, and providing a user with a sum of electronic money in the form of an electronic money coin for undoing the function. When an undo request is received by a

server from a client station, an earlier state of a manipulated computer object is obtained. Then, an amount of electronic money associated with the client station is generated on the server, and a response is sent to the client station. The response comprises a sum of electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin and is less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server for the execution of the function. Thus, where a user may perform an operation on the object and pays for the operation, but then later wants to have the operation undone, the user is provided with an amount of electronic money in the form of an electronic money coin for the undo operation.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 is a method of undoing execution of a function requested by a first client station on a computer object stored on a server station of a communication network, comprising the following steps, receiving from a client station a request to undo execution of the function on the computer object, the execution of the function being an operation to manipulate the object from an earlier state of the object to a manipulated state of the object, obtaining on the server station the earlier state of the manipulated object, generating electronic money on the server station, associated with the first client station, and sending a response to the first client station via the communication network, the response comprising a sum of the electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin, less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function.

Independent Claim 12 is an apparatus claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 12, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a server station receiving a request to undo execution of a function on a computer object, the execution of the function being requested by a first client station and being an operation to manipulate the object from an earlier state of the object to a manipulated state of the object, generating electronic money associated with the first client station, and sending a response to the first client station that sent the undo request, where the response comprises a sum of electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin, less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function.

Wilkins merely converts low-resolution images into high-resolution images, but as rightly admitted in the Office Action, fails to teach sending a response to a first client station that sent the undo request, where the response comprises a sum of electronic money less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function. Moreover, Wilkins is not seen to teach the feature of the server station generating a sum of electronic money associated with the first client station, or that the sum of electronic money comprises at least one electronic money coin.

Cheng disclose a software update system to update software products installed on client computers. Cheng stores state information of the client computer before the software update, and saves archive copies of files that might be altered or removed by the software update. If the client wants to undo the software update, the archive files are restored so that the computer can be returned to its previous state. If a software update is

undone, transaction fees for the update are applied as a credit back to the user's credit card account. Thus, Cheng is not seen to generate, on the server station, electronic money, or that the electronic money comprises at least one electronic money coin. Rather, the transaction fees are merely credited back to the user's credit card as a refund. Cheng is also not seen to teach the feature of sending a response to a first client station that sent the undo request, where the response comprises a sum of electronic money comprising at least one electronic money coin, less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the execution of the function. Rather, in Cheng, the client computer is merely notified of an amount of a refund being credited to the user's credit card, but no actual refund or electronic money are sent to the client computer.

Cockrill is merely seen to teach a system in which a sum of an outstanding transaction for a customer is determined. If the sum is greater than a billing threshold, a server generates a payment request that is directed to a payment authority or payment processor. However, like Wilkins and Cheng, Cockrill is not seen to teach that a server generates a sum of electronic money corresponding to the first client station, or that the electronic money comprises at least one electronic money coin, or the sending of the response that includes the electronic money, as claimed.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, independent Claims 1 and 12, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____

Attorney for Applicants
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1692582v1